

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-5, 8-19, 22-24, 26-29, 32-38, 40, 41, and 43-54 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 2, 5, 8, 12, 22-24, 26, 32, 35-36 and 49-52 are amended and new claims 53 and 54 are added.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the courtesies extended by Examiner Nguyen during the telephonic interview on January 7 with applicant's representative, Mr. Oren. The substance of the interview is incorporated in the following remarks. The Examiner agreed that the above claim amendments were acceptable.

Applicant gratefully acknowledges the Office Action's indication that claims 4, 14-19, 27, 28, 33, 34, 41 and 47 are allowed. Applicant also respectfully notes that claims 5, 8-11, 35-38, 44-46 and 48 have not been rejected based on the prior art, and therefore are believed to be allowable over the prior art.

The Office Action objects to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. §1.183(a) because the feature relating to a first part of the divided display type information being embedded into a vertical sync signal is not shown in the drawings. By this Amendment, each of independent claims 5 and 8 is amended to delete the feature relating to the vertical sync line. Withdrawal of the objection to the drawings is respectfully requested.

The Office Action objects to claims 22-24, 32 and 35-36 because of informalities, and rejects claims 49-52 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments to the claims obviate the grounds for objection and rejection.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 12-13, 22-24, 26, 29, 32, 40, 43-46 and 48-52 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter that is not described in the specification to reasonably convey to one skilled in the art that the inventor had possession of the claimed invention. In particular, the Office Action indicates that the originally filed disclosure does not contain sufficient information regarding “a recognition code that does not correspond to a memory address” as recited in independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 26.

It is well settled that an applicant is not limited to the nomenclature in the application as filed, and that an applicant may amend the claims and specification to provide antecedent basis for new nomenclature. See MPEP §608.01(o). In order to further prosecution, independent claim 1 is amended to recite a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding display type information. Independent claim 2 (and similarly independent claim 12) is amended to recite a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding video signal display type information. Additionally, independent claim 26 is amended to recite a data-identifying recognition code for identifying a specific kind of the corresponding video signal display type data. Examiner Nguyen agreed to these amendments during the telephonic interview.

It is also respectfully submitted that the originally filed specification adequately supports these features of independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 26. That is, the originally filed specification clearly sets forth that the display information is composed of recognition codes

and data. Each of the recognition codes specifically identifies a specific kind of display type information. See page 20, line 12-page 21, line 2, and Figure 8. One example identified in the specification is that the recognition code is composed of two bits, although the specification indicates that other numbers of bits may also be utilized. The specification and FIG. 8 make it clear that the two bits (in the one example) are not a memory address but rather identify a specific kind of data (i.e., a number of dots in a horizontal period, the number of backporches in a horizontal period, etc.). Thus, the specification is clear to one skilled in the art that the disclosed recognition code is a data-identifying recognition code. This terminology would be well known to one skilled in the art from reading the specification. Thus, the specification fully supports these claimed features.

Additionally, the data-identifying recognition code clearly identify a specific kind of the corresponding video signal display type information. For example, see the paragraph bridging pages 20-21 and the data-identifying recognition code specifically identify a specific kind of information.

As such, the specification adequately describes, to one skilled in the art, the claimed features relating to the data-identifying recognition code as set forth in independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 26. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action also rejects claims 5, 8-11 and 35-38 under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification. By this

Amendment, each of independent claims 5 and 11 is amended to delete the features relating to the first part of the divided display type information being embedded into a vertical sync signal. That is, independent claim 5 now recites that a first part of the divided display type information is embedded into a horizontal sync signal. Independent claim 8 is similarly amended. The remaining features of claims 5 and 8 are adequately disclosed in the specification. Examiner Nguyen agreed that the above amendments to these claims obviated this rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 2, 12, 22-24, 26 and 49-52 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) by U.S. Patent 5,986,636 to Wu. The Office Action also rejects claims 13, 29, 32, 40 and 43 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Wu and further in view of U.S. Patent 5,457,473 to Arai et al. (hereinafter "Arai"). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant maintains the arguments set forth in the previous response. Independent claim 1 recites the display type information including a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding display type information, and data corresponding to the data-identifying recognition code.

As discussed during the telephonic interview, Wu does not teach or suggest all these features. That is, Wu discloses that an information packet may be transmitted including addresses and data between a start bit and a stop bit. The Office Action asserts that the claimed recognition code corresponds to a plurality of addresses. See Wu, column 7, lines

11-18. However, Wu clearly does not teach or suggest a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding display type information. That is, Wu's information packet merely includes addresses and data. This is not a data-identifying recognition code. Additionally, Wu's information packet does not identify a specific kind of the corresponding display type information. Accordingly, independent claim 1 defines patentable subject matter.

Each of independent claims 2, 12 and 26 define patentable subject matter for at least similar reasons. That is, independent claim 2 recites a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding video signal display type information. Further, independent claim 12 recites a data-identifying recognition code that identifies a specific kind of the corresponding display type information, and independent claim 26 recites a data-identifying recognition code for identifying a specific kind of the corresponding video signal display type data. Wu does not teach or suggest at least these features as discussed during the personal interview.

Accordingly, each of independent claims 1, 2, 12 and 26 defines patentable subject matter. Claims 23-24, 29, 44, 49 and 53-54 depend from claim 1, claims 32, 45 and 50 depend from claim 2, claims 13, 40, 46 and 51 depend from claim 12 and claims 43, 48 and 52 depend from claim 26 and therefore define patentable subject matter at least for this reason.

In addition, the dependent claims also recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references. For example, the Office Action has not rejected dependent claims 44, 45, 46 and 48 based on prior art. Each of these claims is believed to be allowable over the prior art at least for the features recited therein.

Additionally, dependent claim 53 recites that the data-identifying recognition code comprises two bits to identify the specific kind of the corresponding display type information. Dependent claim 54 recites that the data-identifying recognition code specifically identifies one of a plurality of different kinds of the corresponding display type information. Wu's information packet does not teach or suggest these features. Dependent claims 53 and 54 define patentable subject matter at least for this additional reason.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 8-19, 22-24, 26-29, 32-38, 40, 41 and 43-54 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney, **David C. Oren**, at the telephone number listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this,

Serial No. 09/628,503
Response to the Office Action dated August 22, 2003

Attorney Docket No. K-191

concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607
and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
FLESHNER & KIM, LLP



Daniel Y.J. Kim
Registration No. 36,186
David C. Oren
Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200
Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200
703 766-3701 DYK:DCO/kam
Date: January 7, 2004

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610